

Quantum logic as superbraids of entangled qubit world lines

Jeffrey Yepez

¹*Air Force Research Laboratory, Hanscom Air Force Base, Massachusetts 01731*

Presented is a topological representation of quantum logic that views entangled qubit spacetime histories (or qubit world lines) as a generalized braid, referred to as a superbraid. The crossing of world lines is purely quantum in nature, most conveniently expressed analytically with ladder-operator-based quantum gates. At a crossing, independent world lines can become entangled. Complicated superbraids are systematically reduced by recursively applying novel quantum skein relations. If the superbraid is closed (*e.g.* representing quantum circuits with closed-loop feedback, quantum lattice gas algorithms, loop or vacuum diagrams in quantum field theory), then one can decompose the resulting superlink into an entangled superposition of classical links. In turn, for each member link, one can compute a link invariant, *e.g.* the Jones polynomial. Thus, a superlink possesses a unique link invariant expressed as an entangled superposition of classical link invariants.

PACS numbers: 03.67.-a, 02.10.Kn, 03.67.Lx

Keywords: topological quantum logic, entangled world lines, quantum skein relation, superbraid, superlink

In topological quantum computing [1, 2], a quantum gate operation derives from braiding quasiparticles, *e.g.* two Majorana zero-energy vortices made of entangled Cooper-pair states in a $p + ip$ superconductor where the vortex-vortex phase interaction has a non-abelian $SU(2)$ gauge group [3, 4]. Dynamically braiding such quantum vortices (point defects in a planar cross-section of the condensate) induces phase shifts in the quantum fluid's multiconnected wave function. Local nonlinear interactions between defects (vortex-vortex straining) is otherwise neglected, *i.e.* the separation distance δ of the zero mode vortices is much greater than the vortex core size, which scales as the coherence length $\xi \ll \delta$ in quantum fluids. The braiding occurs adiabatically so the quantum fluid remains in local equilibrium and the number of defects (qubits) remains fixed. For implementations, the usual question is how can quantum logic gates, and in turn quantum algorithms, be represented by braiding defects, quasiparticles with a nonabelian gauge group.

This Rapid Communication addresses the related fundamental question about the relationship between quantum entanglement, tangled strands, and quantum logic [5]. How can a quantum logic gate, and in turn a quantum algorithm, be decomposed into a linear combination (entangled superposition) of classical braid operators? The goal is to comprehend and categorize quantum algorithms topologically. This is done by first viewing a quantum gate as a braid of two qubit spacetime histories or world lines. Qubit-qubit interaction associated with a quantum gate is rendered as a tree-level scattering diagram, a form of ribbon graph. Then, a quantum algorithm is represented as a weave of such graphs, a **superbraid** of qubit world lines. Finally, one closes a superbraid to form a **superlink**. In fact, quantum lattice gas algorithms, *e.g.* employed for the simulation of superfluids themselves [6], are a good superlink archetype, hence the shared nomenclature.

With this technology we can calculate superlink invari-

ants (Laurent series in linear combination). In principle, each algorithm has its own unique linear combination of invariant Laurent polynomials; *e.g.* two competing quantum circuit implementations of a particular algorithm can be judged equivalent, irrespective of circuit schemes and number of gates and wires. If two quantum algorithms, first and second-order accurate, are topologically equivalent, then the simpler one can be used for analytical predictions of their common effective theory while the latter for faster simulations on smaller grids.

In short, presented is a quantum generalization of the Temperley-Lieb algebra TL_Q and Artin braid group B_Q : a superbraid and its closure, a superlink, is formed out of the world lines of Q qubits (strands) undergoing dynamics generated by quantum gates. Furthermore, the superbraid representation of quantum dynamics works equally well for either bosonic or fermionic quantum simulations. There exists a classical limit where the quantum Temperley-Lieb algebra and the superbraid group, defined below, reduce to the usual Temperley-Lieb algebra and braid group.

Classical braid operators (nearest neighbor permutations), represented in terms of Temperley-Lieb algebra [7], were originally discovered in six-vertex Potts models and statistical mechanical treatments of two-dimensional lattice systems [8, 9]. The quantum algorithm to compute the Jones polynomial [10, 11] employs unitary gate operators that are mapped to unitary representations of the braid group, *i.e.* generated by hermitian representations of the Temperley-Lieb algebra. To prepare for our presentation of superbraids as a novel topological representation of the quantum logic underlying quantum information dynamics, let us first briefly mention some basics of knot theory and some basic quantum gate technology using qubit ladder operators.

A link comprising Q strands, denoted by L say, is the closure of a braid. The Jones polynomial $V_L(A)$ is an invariant of L [12], where A is a complex parameter as-

line (or ribbon). The external lines either over-cross or under-cross and are assigned +1 and -1 multiplying the action, *i.e.* $\pm\zeta\mathcal{E}_\Delta$. This sign disambiguates between a quantum gate and its adjoint, respectively, as shown in (10a) and (10b). Let us denote a qubit graphically $|q_\alpha\rangle \equiv u_\alpha \uparrow + d_\alpha \downarrow$, with complex amplitudes constrained by conservation of probability $|u_\alpha|^2 + |d_\alpha|^2 = 1$.

Starting, for example, with a separable input state $|\psi\rangle = |q_\alpha\rangle|q_\gamma\rangle$, a scattering diagram is a quantum superposition of four oriented graphs

$$\begin{aligned} |q_\alpha\rangle |q_\gamma\rangle &= u_\alpha u_\gamma \text{graph} + u_\alpha d_\gamma \text{graph} \\ &+ d_\alpha u_\gamma \text{graph} + d_\alpha d_\gamma \text{graph}. \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

Each oriented scattering graph can be reduced to a quantum superposition of classical graphs, or just a single classical graph, as the case may be. There are four **quantum skein relations** representing dynamics generated by (8)

$$\text{graph} = \text{graph} \quad (12a)$$

$$\text{graph} = \frac{-A^2 - A^{-2}e^{i\zeta}}{d} \text{graph} + \frac{ie^{-i\zeta}(e^{i\zeta} - 1)}{d} \text{graph} \quad (12b)$$

$$\text{graph} = \frac{-A^2e^{i\zeta} - A^{-2}}{d} \text{graph} - \frac{ie^{i\zeta}(e^{i\zeta} - 1)}{d} \text{graph} \quad (12c)$$

$$\text{graph} = 1 + (e^{i\zeta} - 1)\Delta \text{graph} \quad (12d)$$

These are the quantum analog of (3). Adjoint quantum skein relations are obtained simply by taking $\zeta \rightarrow -\zeta$ in the amplitudes in the diagrams in (12). All superbraids can be reduced to a quantum superposition of classical braids. The closure of a superbraid forms a superlink. Hence, a superlink can be reduced to a quantum superposition of classical links, and consequently, for each superlink one can compute a superlink invariant, for example a superposition of Jones polynomials.

In the context of quantum information dynamics, a physical interpretation of the parameter A can be rendered as follows. If the strands in L are considered closed spacetime histories of Q qubits (e.g. qubit states evolving in a quantum circuit with closed-loop feedback), then the L.H.S. of (12) represent a trajectory configuration within a piece of the superlink where entanglement is generated by a qubit-qubit coupling that occurs at a quantum-gate (*i.e.* generalized crossing point). For the 1-body cases (12b) and (12c), the R.H.S. represents classical alternatives in quantum superposition: $d^{-1}(-A^2 - A^{-2}e^{i\zeta})$ is the amplitude for no interaction (non-swapping of qubit states) whereas the amplitude of a SWAP interaction (interchanging of qubit states) goes as $d^{-1}(e^{i\zeta} - 1)$.

As an example of reducing a superbraid, let us recursively apply (12) to prove an obvious evolution identity: the composition of a quantum gate with its adjoint is the identity operator, *i.e.* $UU^\dagger = 1$. For simplicity, we start with $|q_\alpha\rangle = \uparrow$ and $|q_\gamma\rangle = \downarrow$, so the initially oriented superbraid is reduced to a superposition of classical braids as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{graph} \stackrel{(12b)}{=} \frac{-A^2 - A^{-2}e^{i\zeta}}{d} \text{graph} + \frac{ie^{-i\zeta}(e^{i\zeta} - 1)}{d} \text{graph} \quad (13) \\ &\stackrel{(12b)^\dagger}{=} \frac{-A^2 - A^{-2}e^{i\zeta}}{d} \frac{-A^2 - A^{-2}e^{-i\zeta}}{d} \text{graph} + \frac{-A^2 - A^{-2}e^{i\zeta}}{d} \frac{ie^{-i\zeta}(e^{-i\zeta} - 1)}{d} \text{graph} + \frac{ie^{-i\zeta}(e^{i\zeta} - 1)}{d} \text{graph} \\ &\stackrel{(12c)^\dagger}{=} \frac{A^4 + A^{-4} + 2\cos\zeta}{d^2} \text{graph} - \frac{ie^{-i\zeta}}{d^2} (A^2 + A^{-2}e^{i\zeta})(e^{-i\zeta} - 1) \text{graph} - \frac{ie^{-i\zeta}}{d^2} (A^2e^{-i\zeta} + A^{-2})(e^{i\zeta} - 1) \text{graph} + \frac{(e^{-i\zeta} - 1)(e^{i\zeta} - 1)}{d^2} \text{graph} \\ &\stackrel{(4)}{=} \frac{A^4 + A^{-4} + 2\cos\zeta}{d^2} \text{graph} - \frac{ie^{-i\zeta}}{d^2} (A^2e^{-i\zeta} - A^{-2}e^{i\zeta} - A^2 + A^{-2}) \left(\text{graph} - \text{graph} \right) + \frac{2 - 2\cos\zeta}{d^2} \text{graph} \\ &= \text{graph} \end{aligned}$$

It is easy to verify the same result occurs for inputs $|q_\alpha\rangle = \downarrow$ and $|q_\gamma\rangle = \uparrow$. Furthermore, the identity trivially follows for $|q_\alpha\rangle = \uparrow$ and $|q_\gamma\rangle = \uparrow$ and for $|q_\alpha\rangle = \downarrow$ and $|q_\gamma\rangle = \downarrow$ since Δ is boolean.

With adjacent indices, *e.g.* $\gamma = \alpha + 1$ in (9), we need write the first index only (*i.e.* suppress the second index), $\mathcal{E}_{\Delta\alpha} \equiv \mathcal{E}_{\Delta\alpha, \alpha+1}$. Using this compressed notation, (8) satisfies the following **quantum Temperley-Lieb**

algebra

$$\mathcal{E}_{\Delta\alpha}^2 = \mathcal{E}_{\Delta\alpha}, \quad \alpha = 1, 2, \dots, Q-1 \quad (14a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_{\Delta\alpha}\mathcal{E}_{\Delta\alpha\pm 1}\mathcal{E}_{\Delta\alpha} - \mathcal{E}_{\Delta\alpha\pm 1}\mathcal{E}_{\Delta\alpha}\mathcal{E}_{\Delta\alpha\pm 1} = \\ + d^{-2}\mathcal{E}_{\Delta\alpha} - d^{-2}\mathcal{E}_{\Delta\alpha\pm 1} \end{aligned} \quad (14b)$$

$$\mathcal{E}_{\Delta\alpha}\mathcal{E}_{\Delta\beta} = \mathcal{E}_{\Delta\beta}\mathcal{E}_{\Delta\alpha}, \quad |\alpha - \beta| \geq 2. \quad (14c)$$

To help understand this algebra, we may write (14b) as follows

$$\mathcal{E}_{\Delta\alpha}\mathcal{E}_{\Delta\alpha+1}\mathcal{E}_{\Delta\alpha} - d^{-2}\mathcal{E}_{\Delta\alpha} = d^{-2}X_{\alpha,\alpha+1} \quad (15a)$$

$$\mathcal{E}_{\Delta\alpha+1}\mathcal{E}_{\Delta\alpha}\mathcal{E}_{\Delta\alpha+1} - d^{-2}\mathcal{E}_{\Delta\alpha+1} = d^{-2}Y_{\alpha,\alpha+1}, \quad (15b)$$

where $X_{\alpha,\alpha+1}$ and $Y_{\alpha,\alpha+1}$ are introduced solely for the purpose of separating (14b) into two equations. For (15) to be equivalent to (14b), one must demonstrate that $X_{\alpha,\alpha+1} = Y_{\alpha,\alpha+1}$. Inserting (8) into the L.H.S. of (15), after considerable ladder operator algebra, one finds that the difference of the R.H.S. of (15) is

$$\begin{aligned} X_{\alpha,\alpha+1} - Y_{\alpha,\alpha+1} = \Delta(\Delta - 1)[(A^4 - A^{-4})n_{\alpha}n_{\alpha+1}n_{\alpha+2} \\ - A^4n_{\alpha}n_{\alpha+1} + A^{-4}n_{\alpha+1}n_{\alpha+2}], \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

vanishing for boolean Δ . Thus, (14b) follows from (8).

One finds X and Y are proportional to Δ , so a remarkable reduction of (14) occurs for the $\Delta = 0$ case:

$$\mathcal{E}_{0\alpha}^2 = \mathcal{E}_{0\alpha}, \quad \alpha = 1, 2, \dots, Q-1 \quad (17a)$$

$$\mathcal{E}_{0\alpha}\mathcal{E}_{0\alpha\pm 1}\mathcal{E}_{0\alpha} \stackrel{(15)}{=} d^{-2}\mathcal{E}_{0\alpha} \quad (17b)$$

$$\mathcal{E}_{0\alpha}\mathcal{E}_{0\beta} = \mathcal{E}_{0\beta}\mathcal{E}_{0\alpha}, \quad |\alpha - \beta| \geq 2. \quad (17c)$$

This is the Temperley-Lieb algebra over a system of Q qubits (TL_Q). Thus, entangled bosonic states generated by $\mathcal{E}_{0\alpha}$ are isomorphic to links generated by $\mathcal{E}_{0\alpha}$. So (14) is a generalization of TL_Q . We now consider the generalized braid that it generates: a superbraid.

A general **superbraid operator** is an amalgamation of both a classical braid operator and a quantum gate

$$b_{\Delta\alpha\beta}^s \equiv A e^{z\mathcal{E}_{\Delta\alpha\beta}}, \quad (18)$$

where A and z are complex parameters. (18) can be applied to any two qubits, α and β , in a system of qubits (*i.e.* we do not impose a restriction to the adjacency case when $\beta = \alpha + 1$). (18) can be written in several different ways, each way useful in its own right.

Letting $z \equiv i\zeta + \ln \tau$, the superbraid operator has the following exponential form

$$b_{\Delta\alpha\beta}^s \equiv \tau^4 e^{(i\zeta + \ln \tau)\mathcal{E}_{\Delta\alpha\beta}} = \tau^4 (e^{i\zeta}\tau)^{\mathcal{E}_{\Delta\alpha\beta}}, \quad (19a)$$

where $\tau^4 \equiv A$. The superbraid operator can be written linearly in its generator

$$b_{\Delta\alpha\beta}^s = A [\mathbf{1}_Q + (A^{-4}e^{i\zeta} - 1)\mathcal{E}_{\Delta\alpha\beta}] \quad (20a)$$

$$= A \mathbf{1}_Q + A^{-1}d \left(\frac{1 - e^{i\zeta}\tau}{1 + \tau} \right) \mathcal{E}_{\Delta\alpha\beta}. \quad (20b)$$

A non-trivial classical limit of quantum logic gates represented as (9) occurs at $\zeta = \pi$ (SWAP operator). Consequently, the superbraid operator in product form is

$$b_{\Delta\alpha\beta}^s \equiv \tau^4 e^{(\ln \tau + i\pi)\mathcal{E}_{\Delta\alpha\beta}} e^{(i\zeta - i\pi)\mathcal{E}_{\Delta\alpha\beta}} \quad (21a)$$

$$= b_{\Delta\alpha\beta} e^{i(\zeta - \pi)\mathcal{E}_{\Delta\alpha\beta}}, \quad (21b)$$

where $b_{\Delta\alpha\beta} = \tau^4 e^{(\ln \tau + i\pi)\mathcal{E}_{\Delta\alpha\beta}}$ is the conventional braid operator. (21b) is useful for comprehending the physical behavior of the superbraid operator. It classically braids world lines α and β and quantum mechanically entangles these world lines according to the deficit angle $\zeta - \pi$.

The superbraid group is defined by

$$b_{\alpha}^s b_{\beta}^s = b_{\beta}^s b_{\alpha}^s, \quad \text{for } |\alpha - \beta| > 1 \quad (22a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} b_{\alpha}^s b_{\alpha+1}^s b_{\alpha}^s + \gamma b_{\alpha}^s = b_{\alpha+1}^s b_{\alpha}^s b_{\alpha+1}^s + \gamma b_{\alpha+1}^s, \\ \text{for } 1 \leq \alpha < Q, \end{aligned} \quad (22b)$$

where γ is a constant that depends on the representation. For (8), we have $\gamma = (A^4 + A^{-4}e^{i\zeta})(1 + e^{i\zeta})A^{-2}d^{-2}$.

In the classical limit $\zeta = \pi$, the superbraid operator reduces to the classical braid operator, $b_{\alpha} \equiv b_{\alpha}^s(\pi, \tau)$, and (22) reduces to the Artin braid group

$$b_{\alpha} b_{\beta} = b_{\beta} b_{\alpha}, \quad \text{for } |\alpha - \beta| > 1 \quad (23a)$$

$$b_{\alpha} b_{\alpha+1} b_{\alpha} = b_{\alpha+1} b_{\alpha} b_{\alpha+1}, \quad \text{for } 1 \leq \alpha < Q. \quad (23b)$$

(23) follows from (22) because $\gamma = 0$ for $\zeta = \pi$. Also, in this classical limit, (20a) reduces to the braid operator $b_{\alpha} = A \mathbf{1}_Q + A^{-1}d \mathcal{E}_{\Delta\alpha\beta}$, for $\alpha = 1, 2, \dots, Q-1$. After some ladder operator algebra, one finds that

$$\begin{aligned} b_{\alpha} b_{\alpha+1} b_{\alpha} - b_{\alpha+1} b_{\alpha} b_{\alpha+1} = \\ A^{-1}(A^4 - A^{-4})d^{-2}\Delta(\Delta - 1)(1 - n_{\alpha})n_{\alpha+1}n_{\alpha+2}, \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

where $n_{\alpha} \equiv a_{\alpha}^{\dagger}a_{\alpha}$. Since Δ is boolean, the R.H.S. vanishes, and this is just (23b).

-
- [1] P. Zanardi et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 067902 (2003).
 - [2] C. Nayak et al., Rev. Mod. Phys. **80**, 1083 (2008)
 - [3] D. A. Ivanov, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 268 (2001).
 - [4] S. Tewari et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 010506 (2007).
 - [5] L. Kauffman et al. New J. Phys. **6**, 134 (2004).
 - [6] J. Yepez et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. (2009). To appear. arXiv: quant-ph/0905.0159v1
 - [7] H. N. V. Temperley and E. H. Lieb, Proc. Roy. Soc. Lond. A. Math. Phys. Sci. **322**, 251 (1971).
 - [8] R. J. Baxter, *Exactly Solved Models in Statistical Mechanics* (Academic Press, London, 1982).
 - [9] D. Levy, Phys. Rev. Lett. **64**, 499 (1990).
 - [10] D. Aharonov, V. Jones, Z. Landau, in *STOC '06: Proc. 38th ACM Sym. Theory of Comp.* 2006), pp. 427–436.
 - [11] L. H. Kauffman et al., in *Quantum information theory*, (SPIE, 2007), vol. 6573, p. 65730T.
 - [12] V. Jones, Bull., New Ser., Am. Math. Soc. **12**, 103 (1985).
 - [13] P. Jordan and E. Wigner, Zeits. Physik A **47**, 631 (1928).
 - [14] A. L. Fetter and J. D. Walecka, *Quantum Theory of Many-Particle Systems*, (McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, 1971).